

The Principia.

First Principles in Religion, Morals, Government, and the Economy of Life.

VOL. I.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, JUNE 16, 1860.

NO. 31.

The Principia

Published Weekly, at 339 Pearl Street, (two doors above
Harpers' Buildings) New-York.

WILLIAM GOODSELL, Editor.

SAMUEL WILDE, Proprietor.

TERMS: One Dollar a year, in advance.

Direct business letters, with remittances, to

MELANCTHON B. WILLIAMS, Publishing Agent,

as above.

PROSPECTUS.

Our object, by this publication, is to promote pure religion, sound morals, Christian reforms; the abolition of slaveholding, caste, the rum-traffic, and kindred crimes—the application of Christian principles to all the relations, duties, business arrangements, and aims of life;—to the individual, the family, the Church, the State, the Nation—to the work of converting the world to God, restoring the common brotherhood of man, and rendering Society the type of heaven. Our text book is the Bible; our standard, the Divine law; our expediency, obedience; our plan, the Gospel; our trust, the Divine promise; our panoply, the whole armor of God.

Editors friendly, please copy, or notice.

THE AMERICAN OLIGARCHY—WHEREIN LIES ITS STRENGTH!

NUMBER TEN.

THE EMBRYO CASTE OF WHITE SLAVES.—NO POLITICAL SECURITIES AGAINST IT.

The national tolerance of a caste of slaveholders—we repeat the affirmation—is the national tolerance of a controlling, lordly caste, an oligarchy, needing no other title or charter of nobility, than that which is contained and wrapped up in the national permission to be slaveholders, owners of human beings, and holding them as chattels. No Oligarchy on earth holds a stronger national guaranty of its exclusive prerogatives than this; and none other holds an authority equally unlimited, absolute and above restriction. That such an oligarchy should limit itself, or be permanently limited to the despotic control of men of one complexion or descent, only, is incredible—is inconceivable.

If the Nation tolerates slaveholding, how shall the practice be long restricted by, or excluded from any part of the same nation, or from any hue or lineage of the inhabitants, especially in a country like America, where no public recorded genealogies are preserved, where few persons know the names of their great-great grandfathers, where a continued intermingling of all the races is steadily going forward, where this is especially the fact in the parts of the nation actually overrun with slaves, where paternal descent when ascertained, is no bar to enslavement, and where the slaveholders are, extensively, the fathers or half-brothers, uncles, or cousins of their own slaves? The restriction of slavery to one race, distinguished at present by color, must speedily become an impossibility, in such a country, of course. With each successive generation, the lines of demarcation must become fainter and fainter, as predicted by Henry Clay, and as we see to be the fact. So rapidly is the bleaching process going on, that the slaveholders, if intending to remain such, must lose no time in establishing the doctrine that slavery is not to be confined to the blacks, but extended also to the whites, or there must be fresh importations from Africa, or both,—otherwise their slaveholding must soon come to an end, as they are well aware.

The great mass of our Northern communities—the majority of anti-slavery men, abolitionists, and readers of the PRINCIPIA even, will probably be ready to console themselves with the belief that there is no great danger of any such change being wrought in the public sentiment of the nation, or at least, at the North, as should tolerate, for one moment, the idea of enslaving white people! "Why!" they will exclaim—"the man that would advocate making slaves of us, the white folks, would be drummed out of town—rid-den upon a rail—allowed no place in decent society!"

Would he? Think again. Look around you, and see.

To what political party do you belong? Who are you voting for, to be the chief rulers of the nation? Who are holding the high offices of the nation, by the assistance of Northern votes—the votes of your neighbors, if not your own? And what are the views of the office-holders, the candidates, and the leaders of the political parties, on this very question? In the preceding numbers of this paper, you have seen the names of some of them, and their public declarations of sentiment, on this subject.

There was JOHN C. CALHOUN of South Carolina, a graduate of Yale College, New Haven, Ct.,—"a distinguished and honored son of Yale,"—the controller, more than any other one man, of the national policy, from the year 1812, when his fiat drove the United States into the war with Great Britain, to the day of his death, about forty years afterward. CALHOUN was, for a time, Vice President, by the aid of Northern votes,—the votes, extensively, of the very class of society—the laborers—whom he pronounced to be, naturally, on a level with slaves, who put the sentiment into a public document, and procured its adoption, by the Senate, with Northern votes. Does this look as if the advocates of the enslavement of the whites of the North, were in danger of being "drummed out of town?"

There was BENJAMIN WATKINS LEIGH, who denied that laborers are capable of entering into political affairs. Mr. Leigh, some time after that denial, made a Northern tour, and so far from being "ridden upon a rail," for his insults of the white laborers of the country, was treated with sumptuous dinners, invited to make a speech in Boston, and on Bunker Hill, and was talked of by Northern Whigs, as a suitable Whig candidate for the Vice Presidency of the United States.

There was HENRY CLAY, of whose unbounded popularity at the North, we need say nothing, and whose arguments against the abolition of slavery, gradual or immediate, while he admitted that, within a brief period, there would be no distinctions of race or color in this country, we have already presented and considered.

Remember, when you vote with the so-called Democratic party, as a national party of the North and South, you are voting with a party as strongly pledged to the perpetual tolerance by the nation, of American Slavery, as any political party can possibly be—a party under the control of the extremist advocates of slavery, whose defence of slavery, as we have shown, is the defence of white slavery—slavery without distinction of race or complexion. Judge Taney, in his Dred Scott dicta, in order to cast dust in the eyes of Northern people predicated slavery only of persons "of African descent." But our extracts have sufficiently shown the prevailing sentiment of the slaveholders, including, especially, the Southern leaders of the Democratic party, and that they advocate the enslavement of whites.

Remember too, when you vote with the so-called Republican party, you vote with a party politically pledged to "let slavery alone in the States where it already exists," and where whites are already held as slaves. You vote, in other words, against any such change of the national policy, as shall withdraw, remove, or terminate the national tolerance or permission of slaveholding—the national consent to the existence, within the nation, of a lordly caste, an oligarchy, holding absolute power over a large, indefinite, and rapidly increasing part of the American people. And you vote all this, irrespective of the race or complexion of the persons to be held in slavery—for white slaves are already held at the South—the relative proportion of white slaves is constantly increasing, and will increase, till all the slaves become white, by the natural laws of population, as hinted at, by HENRY CLAY. You vote for a perpetual national tolerance or permission, within the nation, of a caste of slaveholders, who claim, and already exercise the assumed right of enslaving white people.

Politically, then, there is not only no obstacle presented, by either of the two great political parties, against the enslavement of white people as well as of black people, the enslavement of Anglo-Saxons as well as of Africans. On the contrary, both these parties are pledged in advance, against any withholding of the national tolerance, (equivalent to the national permission, the national guaranty, in effect) of an oligarchy of enslavers of men, women, and children, in perpetuity, irrespective of race or complexion. For neither of these political parties, in dealing with the question of slavery, make any distinction or reservation in respect to the color or lineage of the persons enslaved, though their party leaders well knew the facts of the case and the claims of the slaveholders thus indorsed and recognized, to be precisely what we have just now stated them.

All our political compromises with slavery and slaveholders, have been wholly irrespective of the race or the color of the slaves. We have had a Missouri compromise, fixing the latitudinal line of slavery at 36° 30'. We have now on hand, the Republican project for interdicting its introduction into new Territories. We have also the Douglas and Eli Thayer squatter sovereignty project, (acted upon by all the Republicans in the House of Representatives, in the adoption of the Crittenden Lecompton compromise for Kansas, and in reality favored by many Republicans, ever since, particularly in Connecticut, where it was made a plank of the platform on which the Republicans carried their last State election,) by which the question of slavery or of no slavery is to be decided by the vote of the majority of the actual settlers of a Territory. But, in all this, and in all our political history, we have had no Mason and Dixon, or Missouri compromise line between races or complexions—no specification of the degrees of affinity or intermixture of races—as in some other slave countries—at which slavery should terminate, and freedom commence. All is left open and optional with the slaveholder, as much as to tell him he may enslave whomsoever he pleases, or can find means of enslaving, whether white or black, provided it be done only within certain geographical lines and boundaries.

All this shows clearly and impressively enough, we should think, that in the arena of politics, at least, there is no such existing public sentiment against the enslavement of the whites, as could afford them the shadow of protection against that condition, whenever circumstances should favor its gradual introduction, as is already the fact, at the South, as will be farther shown, as we proceed.

And, how is it, in the departments of legislation and jurisprudence? We have legislation, imposing oppressive liabilities upon the free colored people, forbidding their exercise of important rights, and withholding from them the benefits of legal protection. But have we any forbidding the enslavement of free whites? Neither one of our two national enactments for the rendition of fugitives make any exception in favor of whites, or of Anglo-Saxons who may be claimed as fugitives from "service and labor." The United States Commissioner asks no questions and shows no signs of hesitancy on account of the complexion or apparent race of the chattel claimed and seized. The bill of sale, the last will and testament, the certificate of distribution of estate, the attested identification of the person seized, settle the whole question. Frequently recurring facts of this character show us, by the bye, that the process of enslaving the whites has already commenced—a topic which we may consider farther, and in other particulars, hereafter. We introduce the topic here, merely to show, that the now existing legislation and jurisprudence of the country, established and administered at the North, as well as at the South, established and perpetuated by Northern votes, as part and parcel of our national policy legislation, jurisprudence, and executive administration, (which we are now told, even by an editor of a religious anti-slavery paper, a wise and good

President of the United States may, and must needs carry into execution, as a means of preventing anarchy, and to avoid becoming a perjurer, are so shaped as to secure the rendition to slavery, of white as well as colored persons.

Yes! Even the national policy, adopted for the protection and support of slavery, as embodied in its legislation, adjudication and administration, make no discrimination in favor of *whites*, claimed as slaves! They assume and take for granted that *white* men may be held as slaves, that they may escape, and that they must be seized by the national arm and sent back to slavery—which in fact has doubtless been done again and again.

And even the newly nominated Presidential Candidate, of the Republican party, Mr. Lincoln, tells us distinctly, that he is in favor of a national Fugitive Slave Act, that shall be effectual to secure the rendition of fugitive slaves; and that, although some of the features of the present Act, may be objectionable, yet he would be sorry to see any agitation for its modification or change. If elected, he will come into office fully pledged to enforce that diabolical act, as Millard Fillmore, Franklin Pierce, and James Buchanan have done before him. Yet Mr. Lincoln, it may be presumed, is not ignorant that the Fugitive Slave Act, is just as well adapted to the seizure and rendition of *whites* as of *blacks*, of *free* men as of *slaves*—since it makes no mention of the color or race of the fugitive, nor whether he shall be a slave or a free man, if he but "owe service and labor." So far as the protection of law is concerned, Mr. Lincoln himself, if arrested as a slave to-day, would have no more legal protection, nor means of redress or release—no more title to Constitutional protection, than the blackest slave in the Nation! Yet, in such a nation, and by a people who tolerate a degradation like this, it is doubted whether white people can ever be made slaves! It is doubted in New York, Massachusetts, and Ohio, wherein the spectacle of white fugitives from slavery, is becoming familiar, while the Republican party dare not protect them by a Personal Liberty Bill. What can such a "white man's party" do to protect *whites* from slavery?

Look at another thing, just in this connection. All those expositions of the Constitution of the United States, that make it pro-slavery—all the pretended compromises with slavery, said to be contained in that instrument, are expositions and pretended compromises with slavery, utterly irrespective of color, race or blood. With the single exception of the deceitful and mendacious argument of Judge Taney and his associates on the bench, of the Supreme Court, about persons of "African descent," designed and adapted to mislead and blind the people, the country has never had addressed to it an argument in favor of Constitutional Slavery that ever pretended to make any distinction between white men and black men. No allusion to race, or complexion, can be found in the Constitution. Neither of the clauses claimed as recognizing slavery—the rendition clause—the apportionment clause—the migration and importation clause—suggest, even by implication, the slightest discrimination of hue, race, descent, or birth-place, of "the persons" therein mentioned. The restriction of the power of Congress, inhibiting the prohibition of the "migration and importation" of certain persons until the year 1808, makes no mention of Africa, of Africans, of descendants of Africans, or of slaves. If it may be claimed as having recognized the lawfulness of importing slaves from Africa, prior to the year 1808; it may, with equal propriety be claimed as having recognized the importation of white slaves from France, Germany, Great Britain, or of slaves of any, and every color and race, from every portion of the globe, for the clause makes no limitation or restriction. So far as the Constitution, and expositions of the Constitution are concerned, the slaveholding oligarchy that is tolerated by this nation, and that, by an inevitable necessity controls it, during that tolerance, and in consequence of it, has precisely the same claim, the same arguments, the same pretenses, the same methods of Constitutional exposition, (now in vogue, and generally accepted by Republicans as well as Democrats), for enslaving *white* people, in this country, that it has for enslaving *black* people. And we have already shown, by the open declarations of its chosen political exponents and leaders, that its design is, to urge the claim without any partiality in favor of the exception of *whites*. And our Northern politicians, of all parties, if we may give them

credit for the intelligence and common sense necessary to the management of public affairs, understand all this, perfectly well. And yet, amid all their rivalries, bickerings, and recriminations, they go, with one accord, for the continued national tolerance of slaveholding. Both of them hold or concede the right of Federal slave catching in the States, by supporting Presidential candidates who hold or concede it. Both of them, with all their claims and concessions of State rights, deny, or refuse to exercise the State right of protecting its inhabitants, white or colored, from kidnappers. What reason is there to confide in either one of such parties for the protection of white people from slavery?

For The Principia.

NATIONAL SOVEREIGNTY.

NUMBER II.

It requires but little wisdom to see that a "Union" for the attainment of any objects, must be subject to a GOVERNING AUTHORITY, sufficient to carry the objects into effect, and that, if the Union is a lawful one, its members, whether individuals or State Governments or both, can not rightfully act against its objects. This very plain truth ought to have been a guiding light to our statesmen. But they have been subject to an influence which, if it has not put out their eyes, has strangely perverted their perceptions. Too much engaged in party strifes to study the true science of government, they have been the easy dupes of an interest which, claiming to be a State interest, is equally an enemy of State sovereignty and of the sovereignty of the Union. Are the States of our Union such independent sovereignties that there may be no Federal interference against State tyranny?

Suppose the powers which the people have transferred from our State Governments to the General Government, were again transferred from the General Government to the British Government. Suppose the British Government had the control of our army and navy, the right to declare war and make treaties for us, the whole regulation of our commerce, coinage of our money, the naturalizing of our aliens, the power to tax us, the control of our post-office system, the enactment of all our Federal laws, the establishment of our Federal Courts, and the appointment of Federal officers. What would be thought of the independence of our State Governments? and what ground would there be for great words about State Sovereignty? Suppose further, the British Government obligated to sustain the State Governments against insurrections of the people. Would not this make the State Governments British dependencies? And could this obligation be separated from another, an obligation to require State Governments to be administered with such justice that there could be no cause of insurrection? Could a State, even by a solemn compact, acquire a right of demanding the interposition of a higher government in support of its own tyranny? Never, till an unrighteous compact can be of higher obligation than the sacred law of right. Authority to enforce obedience to a State Government, is inseparable from authority to enforce State justice. No device of man can put them asunder. To release a government from the obligation of justice, would be to unchain a tiger.

Now, transfer the Federal powers back from the British Government to the Federal Government. Does the transfer make the State Governments independent Sovereignties? No, they are dependencies of the Federal Government, as they were just now of the British Government. Talk not of the independence of a State Government which requires the aid of the Federal Government against a score of invaders, headed by John Brown. The State Governments are under a Federal protectorate. And the pledge of Federal protection is coupled with a requisition that the State Governments shall be Republican, in form. But what is a "Republican form of government?" It is a form of which the Federal Constitution is the pattern, and which harmonizes in its objects and structure with that instrument. When "we the people" say, a Republican form of government, we do not mean the worst possible form of despotism. We bargained for justice and liberty, and had no notion of hastening at every call, for the support of tyranny. Investing the General Government with authority to sustain the State Governments, we necessarily and intentionally invested it

with authority to see to the good behaviour of the State Governments, and take care that they should not oppress the people. Had we intended the contrary—had we sought to invest the General Government with authority to sustain State tyranny, the thing could not have been done. And least of all could it have been done by a compact of "justice and liberty."

The powers of Sovereignty possessed by the General Government involve a prohibition of all action against that Sovereignty. The power to raise armies and man the navy prohibits the interference of State Governments with enlistments. The power to appoint Federal officers prohibits State interference against Federal appointments. The Federal power of appointment and enlistment is not restricted by the Constitution to any class or complexion of people. It is universal. To determine who may and who may not be subject to Federal appointments and enlistments, is not a reserved State right. No State ever had it. And a State that chattelizes a portion of her people and thus forbids their appointment or enlistment, interferes with a Federal prerogative. It will hardly be claimed that Pennsylvania could have chattelized Mr. Buchanan against the people's right to make him President. But the people might have elected *Dred Scott* to the Presidency, had they seen fit. There was no more reserved right against his election than against Buchanan's. Slaveholders, in framing and adopting the Constitution, had not even asked for such a reservation. A decent sense of honor would now prevent their setting up the pretense of a tyrannical State right against an essential Federal right. And it is painful to think of the servility that bows to such a pretense, by admitting "the right of each State to order and control in its own domestic institutions, according to its own judgment exclusively," without qualifying the admission, by any reference to the moral and constitutional obligation of both Federal, and State Governments "to establish justice." When will politicians spare time from their equables for power, to study the Constitution? When will they see, what eye cannot help seeing, that there can be no State rights against the rights of humanity? and that, in a Union of States and people for the security of human rights, the State Governments become bound in favor of them, federally as well as morally?

The fact that the Federal Constitution and "the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof," are "the supreme law of the land," binding "the judges in every State,"—"anything in the Constitution or the laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding," does not look as if the Federal Government, in order to fulfill its own mission of establishing justice, must first go begging and bowing to the State Governments for permission. But it does look a little as if the State Governments themselves were subject to the Federal Constitution and the laws of the United States.

The right of Sovereignty is original and complete in the people. Briefly stated, it is the right, or at least comprehends the right, to suppress all crimes injurious to humanity. To suppress crimes is simply to establish justice. The right is clear, of the people of the United States to come to agreement for establishing justice, by means of a General Government and subordinate State Governments. In suppressing crimes, we do not ask the consent of the criminals. But should they come into the agreement, or pretend to do so, the right would, if possible, be more unquestionable. He who would maintain the absurd proposition, that when the great crimes of humanity are summed up in the single word, *slavery*, and take shelter under something calling itself State Sovereignty, they ought to be treated as sacred rights not to be interfered with,—should be well armed with sophistry, for all sound argument will be against him.

THE BROWN TESTIMONIAL FROM HAYTI.—We understand the wife of John Brown was recently in Boston, to receive the subscription made up in her behalf and her family, and sent by the people of Hayti as a testimonial of their respect and gratitude for one who perished on the scaffold to maintain their rights against those who hold them in bondage; that is, the rights of the colored people. This expression of gratitude amounted to about \$30,000.—*New Bedford Mercury*, June 6

To the Editor
SIR: For
tor of the
to liberal
him by p
myself, I
mendation

WHITE
P. S.—E
very Stand
will favor

[The abo
May 9th, 1

After the
ter for the
send it to
ness for a h

Editor New
SIR:—I s

M. Clay, re
tory of mys
he did this,

To correct
against me,
fall, to aban

stating that
ply, the Phi
re-published

pected to vo
edging Mr.
Kentucky St

that the citi
for the final
would be as

done so, and
For us Ke
tension" of S

evil of it in
fore the wor

I have no
and if he has
well. His la

it do as little
been true to
I must say, I

cause. I ha
crushed cond

I have late
my small prin
let all my fri

peril they wi
My suit is
for redress fo

which, if not
and, though n
and though n

I shall contin
freedom—sha

press in Kent
zens that were

State. Men
because they

down his pen
while such us

Friends wri
ton Ky., inste

A. Foster) is
in the destruct

The Coring
gentleman and

P. S.—Edito
favor equal ju

The annual
in the lecture
last week, the
Clerk, Treasur
Prudential Cor
Pastor. Fifty
friends voting
opposition can

WILLIAM S. BAILEY.

To the Editor of the N. Y. Tribune:

SIR: For years past I have given to Wm. S. Bailey, editor of the *Free South* newspaper, letters asking the friends to liberal opinions in the United States and elsewhere to aid him by pecuniary donations. For reason satisfactory to myself, I feel it my duty to recall all such letters and recommendations.

C. M. CLAY.

WHITE HALL, April 30, 1860.

P. S.—*Boston Atlas*, *New York Evening Post*, *Anti-Slavery Standard*, *Boston Liberator*, and other liberal Journals will favor public justice by publishing the above. C.

[The above letter was published in the N. Y. Tribune, May 9th, 1860.—W. S. B.]

After the Chicago Convention I wrote the following letter for the Tribune, which was not published. I therefore send it to other Journals, and ask that liberality and fairness for a hearing claimed for America to all her citizens.

NEWPORT, Ky., May 21st, 1860.

Editor New York Tribune.

SIR:—I see in your paper in the 9th inst., a card from C. M. Clay, recalling all his letters, for years past, commendatory of myself and labor, to the friends of freedom. Why he did this, I know not.

To correct any wrong impression his letter might make against me, permit me to state that he requested me, last fall, to abandon my (our) Kentucky Free State Platform, stating that he (they of Madison County) had adopted, simply, the Philadelphia Republican Platform of 1856. So I republished said Platform for the sake of unity, as we expected to vote with the Republican party in 1860, acknowledging Mr. Clay as our leader; but did not abandon our Kentucky State Platform as he requested; for I still thought that the citizens of Kentucky should take some State action for the final abolition of Slavery among us; which, I thought, would be as consistent as it was for other States that had done so, and that are now free. I think so still.

For us Kentuckians to raise our voice against the "extension" of Slavery and yet have nothing to say against the evil of it in our own midst, would be, I think, ridiculous before the world, and inconsistent with ourselves.

I have no apology to make to Mr. Clay for my course, and if he has none to make to me for his, I bid him farewell. His letter, I think, will do me but little harm. May it do as little to him. I wish him no ill. I have always been true to principle, and trust ever to remain so. But I must say, his letter is a cold and unnatural thrust, without cause. I have been his shield and helper, and now, in a crushed condition and needy, he seeks my ruin.

I have lately procured a small quantity of type and got my small printing press at home, by which I hope soon to let all my friends hear from me, and I trust in this hour of peril they will not forsake me.

My suit is still pending against the mobites, and I hope for redress for the injuries I received at their hands, after which, if not before, I shall issue *The Free South* again; and, though mobs, fire and persecution have been my fate: and though misguided "non-extensionists," may forsake me, I shall continue to do my duty in the great work of human freedom—shall maintain the liberty of speech and of the press in Kentucky, and contend for the return of our citizens that were banished from Berea, and other parts of our State. Men should never be banished from their homes because they love liberty, nor will any true man ever lay down his pen or close his lips against his fellow sufferers, while such usurpations last.

Friends writing to me will please address, Box 9, Covington Ky., instead of Newport, as the post-master here (J. Q. A. Foster) is a pro-slavery mobite, and assisted, in person, in the destruction of my office.

The Covington post-master, Doctor Holt, is an honorable gentleman and is an opposer of mobs.

Respectfully yours,

WM. S. BAILEY.

P. S.—Editors who published Mr. Clay's letter and who favor equal justice, please copy. W. S. B.

CHURCH OF THE PURITANS.

The annual meeting of Dr. Cheever's Church, was held in the lecture-room of the Church, on Friday evening of last week, the Pastor in the Chair. The Church elected a Clerk, Treasurer, four Deacons and five members of the Prudential Committee, all of them hearty supporters of the Pastor. Fifty-five votes were cast for each officer. Dr. C's friends voting uniformly 43 against scattering numbers for opposition candidates.

INTERESTING CORRESPONDENCE.—CHURCH ACTION AGAINST SLAVERY.

HOPKINTON, June 1, '60.

BRO. WM. GOODELL; Dear Sir:—We have had good meetings of our Church Anti-Slavery Society this week in Boston. The Tremont Temple was crowded both forenoon and evening, and addresses were made that cannot fail to tell for the cause of freedom. But, O when will the church awake to its vast responsibilities in this matter, not more for the sake of the poor down trodden millions in bonds, than for the truth of our glorious Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ? Alas! I fear not till the land is deluged in blood, and the Church made to wander forty years in the wilderness, or endure a worse than seventy years Babylonish captivity.

I herewith enclose a letter from our excellent friend Rev. Wm. B. Dodge of Millburn, Ill., and the late action of the Elgin Association, for which I hope you will find a place in the *Principia*.

With the kindest regards and wishes for your prosperity, I am

Very truly yours,

J. C. WEBSTER.

MILLBURN, April 20, '60.

REV. J. C. WEBSTER; Dear Brother:—I laid the subject of Church Action before our Church at our monthly meeting. After considering and discussing the subject, we resolved unanimously to become auxiliary to the "CHURCH ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY OF THE UNITED STATES."

We cordially adopt its principles and will make it a subject of prayer at our monthly meetings, and take a quarterly contribution in aid of the cause it advocates.

I also brought the subject before our late Meeting of Association and obtained the action which I enclose to you.

There is but one sentiment among the clergy here. We all hold slavery to be the sum total of all the crimes man can commit against man, and almost the highest insult he can offer to the Almighty.

In my view, the claim of property in man robs God of his inalienable right to his rational offspring—and usurps his throne. "All souls are mine," saith the Lord. The slaveholder, says "These persons, soul and body are mine;" and he carries out his claim in defiance of the Almighty, by locking up the soul in heathen ignorance, and corrupting it with numerous temptations to vice; and exacting all the energy and power of the physical system. Slavery, in its mildest form, swallows up the whole man. The slave is a being sunk down into another man's will. As a moral agent his being is blotted out, he is annihilated.

Slavery is not murder, nor adultery, nor theft, nor perjury, nor covetousness only, but the concocted essence of all these crimes. It is one infinite iniquity made up of all conceivable crimes.

This view is my sober conviction of the real character of American slavery. I could as well fellowship the inmates of state prison, as slaveholders who have been favored with light of the nineteenth century.

Dear Brother, If God hath not given me these views of slavery, I know not what it is to be taught by the Word and Spirit of God.

This is the testimony I bear, when not in the least excited, as the deliberate convictions of my mind.

That the Christian Church can endure such an enormity in the land, is, to me, amazing. Slavery is the darkest feature of paganism. It is perfectly inconsistent to send missionaries abroad to convert heathens, while we suffer the very worst features of paganism at home. If Moses should return and enforce the mild features of his law, it would liberate all the slaves in a day, and how the slaveholders could escape the fate of man-stealers, I cannot see.

I have one source of consolation. Christ sees slavery as it is, and he has all power in heaven and upon earth, and I believe he has undertaken the work, both in mercy to the slaves and their oppressors; but if mild means, such as truth and love dictate, fail, we must expect terrible judgments to follow. God has sent messengers of his mercy to the South, but they have, as yet, either shut them up in prison or abused and thrust them away—but if the whole living church, in Christ's name, should demand the emancipation of the slaves, it would in my opinion, bring on a crisis, which would result in great blessings, or terrible judgments.

Thus, brother, I have given you my thoughts just as they

have occurred. What is worth preserving, use, and the chaff cast away.

Believe me yours, in the strong bonds of Christian affection. WM. B. DODGE.

Elgin, (Ill.) Congregational Association—Action against Slavery.

Whereas, American Slavery, in asserting its arrogant claim to chattelize human beings, has fully justified Mr. Wesley's definition of it, as "The sum of all villainies," and

Whereas, God has constituted the Church, for the purpose of maintaining the right, and rebuking sin, whether perpetrated in the dens of pollution, or the Halls of Legislation. Therefore,

Resolved; That we are loudly called to action, to energetic and effective efforts for the entire abolition of this monstrous iniquity.

Resolved; That we cordially approve the course of action recommended by the "CHURCH ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY OF THE UNITED STATES," organized at Worcester, Mass., and, in the "Irrepressible Conflict," now waged between Liberty and Slavery, we pledge them our cheerful and hearty cooperation.

Resolved; That we recommend to the Churches in our connection, the early organization of auxiliaries on the plan proposed by that Society.

Resolved; That we would most effectually recommend to our brethren, "To remember those that are in bonds as bound with them" and to exert their influence, in every appropriate manner, to "Deliver the spoiled out of the hand of the oppressor."

Action of the Elgin Association relative to Slavery, passed at Crystal Lake, April 11, 1860.

J. A. MACK,

Clerk, Pro tem.

LETTER FROM NEW HAVEN, CONN.

NEW HAVEN, June 5th 1860.

BROTHER GOODELL:—I have just been reading the *Principia* of last week, and, as usual, have found it a rich treat. In my humble opinion, if the professed friends of freedom, here, would give a little more practical attention to *PRINCIPIA*, or first principles, they would not much longer have to endure the chagrin of being beat at the polls by the friends of the little giant—By the bye, I notice of late that the former soubriquet, little giant, is applied to Senator Douglas, has been dropped, and that of BULL TERRIER substituted in its room, in some quarters. Doubtless this is significant of his pluck at Charleston, and an earnest of what it is expected to be at Baltimore, on the 18th inst. We shall see. The Douglas men carried the election here yesterday, and jollified till midnight. It is said that the administration of President Buchanan is wholly powerless, and that the victory is the fruit of the popularity of Judge Douglas and his popular sovereignty doctrines. Republicans here, as elsewhere, should learn, that as they have placed themselves astride the stools of anti-extension and anti-abolition, they give squatter sovereignty the privilege of knocking them on both sides. Their stand points are antagonisms, and a house divided against itself must fall. . . . Here in "Elm City" we are not entirely destitute of *Principia*. Here is, at least, one of the graves of the regicides—close to the State House, and in front of old Yale stands a monument erected over the grave of Col. John Dixwell, who, in spite of the English fugitive law, found his way to this country, and though he had been one of the judges to try and condemn King Charles, and, hence a regicide, yet was he greatly respected, and his memory is revered, to this day. And why? Because he acted on, and from *PRINCIPLE*. A few years before his arrival here, two of his associates, Goff and Whalley landed in Boston in 1660; but, being warned that there was danger of the "fugitive law" in that city, they fled to this, arriving here in March 1660, where they were taken care of, (some of the time in his cellar,) by the pious preacher Mr. DAVENPORT; (the doctrine of choosing "lesser evils" and sending back to unjust bondage mothers or brothers had not obtained, in high places here, at that time) but, at length for entire safety, they were domiciled in a chasm between the layers of the red-stone rocks, a mile or two to the Northwest of this city. Afterwards there was found engraved on one of these rocks, "Resistance to tyrants is obedience to God." This hiding place is now called the Judges' Cave. I could mention other *Principia* here, but have not time.

Truly yours,

H. G. F.

The Principia.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, JUNE 16, 1860.

"POLITICAL ETHICS."—THE INDEPENDENT.

We were not mistaken, it seems, when in *The Principia* of May 19, we published and commented upon an editorial of *The Independent*, headed "the Nominations at Chicago," just before the Convention at that place. We understood that journal as maintaining the sentiment that it now avows explicitly, and defends confidently, in the article that follows. We copy it entire from *The Independent* of May 24, that our readers may see both sides; whether the readers of *The Independent*, with its ample size and corresponding price, are permitted the same privilege or no.

"PERJURY AS A QUALIFICATION FOR THE PRESIDENCY."

"The Constitution of the United States (Art. 2, sec. 1) provides that before entering upon the execution of his office, the President elect of the United States shall take the following oath:

"I do solemnly swear that I will faithfully execute the office of President of the United States; and will, to the best of my ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States."

"Sec. 3 of the same article, defining the duties of the President, says: 'He shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed.'"

"One of these laws is the Fugitive-Slave Law; and if any case should arise under that law calling for executive interference, the President would be bound by his oath to execute the law. No such case, however, might arise under the whole period of a Presidential administration. If such a case should arise, a good and true man, hating slavery, and believing the Fugitive-Slave Law to be unjust if not unconstitutional, might nevertheless execute it in good faith, rather than vacate an office in which he could recommend and urge the repeal of the law, rather than resign the government into the hands of the slave power, or introduce despotism or anarchy by refusing to execute a law which he has no power to annul. But this is quite another thing from volunteering to approve the Fugitive Slave Law, and arguing its constitutionality and expediency. The former is simply a yielding to the necessity of one's official position and oath; the latter reveals a disposition to magnify into a virtue what every good man should shrink from even as a necessity. The one shrinks from doing an act which he disapproves; the other volunteers to do the same act because he approves it. A distinction so obvious as this, one would think must be recognized among the very "principia" of political ethics. And yet some who profess to apply the moral law to political action, seem to think that a willingness to perjure oneself by refusing to execute an obnoxious law after having sworn to "take care that the laws be faithfully executed,"—would be the highest moral qualification for the Presidency; and that a usurpation of power transforming the President into an absolute Dictator, would be a righteous act if only done in the name of freedom! Happily such notions have as little influence in the sphere of politics as they have sanction in that of morals."

This is explicit. The "good and true" magistrate may do "evil, that good may come,"—nay, rather, that a supposed greater evil may be prevented! He may execute an enactment that he "believes to be unjust, if not unconstitutional," rather than "resign the Government into the hands of the slave power, or introduce despotism or anarchy by refusing," &c. And this comes from *The Independent*, a professedly orthodox and anti-slavery journal, designed to represent the progressive portion of the Evangelical Congregationalists, a journal that lectures *The Tribune* on its low political ethics, the old Nassau Street Tract Society, on its silence respecting slavery, *The Observer* for its subservience to the lower law of the slaveholders—and Mr. Garrison for infidelity in discrediting or doubting the plenary inspiration of portions of the Scriptures.

Now, in the name of consistent orthodoxy and anti-slavery, in the name of Congregationalism, (theoretical, historical and practical), in the name of evangelical religion, in the name of the Holy Scriptures as the word of God, we take issue with *The Independent* on this point, affirming its sentiments to be heretical, anti-evangelical, anti-orthodox, anti-scriptural, anti-congregational, anti-abolition, anti-christian. They are so, because they are unjust, unmerciful, persecuting, inhuman, at war with the first principles of civil and religious freedom, for which our Puritan fathers contended, for which they were imprisoned and exiled, with which the Church Independency or Congregationalism of the Puritans were identified, in which they had their definition and their origin.

We but repeat the unanimous utterances of the most venerated religious teachers and writers in Christendom, the most widely accredited and time-honored authorities in the sciences of jurisprudence, civil government and law, in the civilized world, when we affirm that chattel slaveholding is a sin against God, a crime against man, forbidden alike, by the law of nature and the Book of revelation, a practice which no circumstances can justify, no enactments can legalize, according to the maxims, that "statutes against fundamental morality are void," that "what is invalid from the beginning, cannot be made valid by length of time," that "the reasonableness of law is the soul of law," that "acts of Parliament contrary to reason, are void," that "the law of nature, being coeval with mankind, and dictated by God himself, is, of course, superior in obligation, to any other."

We but re-echo the common sentiment of the civilized world, including the decent portion of the community in which we live, when we characterize the Slave Code as barbarous, inhuman, unjust, unchristian, (which *The Independent* will not deny,) and when we specify the Fugitive Act of 1850, as among the most barbarous, inhuman, unjust, unchristian enactments of that Code, and one at which human nature, depraved and perverted as it is, instinctively revolts, an act so atrocious that the majority, even of pro-slavery democrats do not, for a moment, hesitate to violate it, when the occasion presents itself—and which—stranger still, even the intensely pro-slavery editor of *The New York Observer*, is believed to have once violated, by permitting a closely pursued fugitive (who had mistaken his office, for the then neighboring Anti-Slavery office) to secrete himself in his premises.

And yet *The Independent* thinks that "a good and true man, hating slavery and believing the 'act' to be unjust, if not unconstitutional, might nevertheless execute it, in good faith." Where did *The Independent* learn "political ethics" like these? Not from the Bible, which says to magistrates, "That which is altogether just shall then follow." "Ye shall not be afraid of man, for the judgment is God's." "Execute judgment, (justice) between a man and his neighbor." "Thou shalt not follow a multitude to do evil, neither shalt thou speak in a cause to decline after many to wrest judgment." Ye "shall judge the people with just judgment." Of all the religions in the world, the religion of the Bible is the most intensely severe against the executing of unjust statutes. And of all the schools of Biblical interpretation, the school of the "Orthodox" expositors is the most intensely rigid, unaccommodating, uncompromizing. Of all the Theological Systems in Christendom, or out of Christendom—of all the systems of ethics—aye—of "political ethics"—in the known world, whether Christian, Jewish, Mohammedan, Pagan, or philosophical, ancient or modern, in the known world, or recorded in the world's literature, there is nothing that approximates to the "Orthodox" Theology and Ethics, in the stern and unbending strictness and purity of its requisitions on the ruler as well as on the subject, on the magistrate as well as on the legislator, forbidding either, on pain of everlasting perdition, to swerve a hair's breadth from the true, the right, and the just, in comity or deference to any human usage or authority, or in conformity with any voluntary or imposed oath or promise to the contrary. If the Bible be the word of God, if the Orthodox or evangelical system be a correct inference or corollary from the Bible, then the President of the United States who, in conformity with his official oath, executes an unjust statute, with a conviction of its injustice, incurs thereby the tremendous penalty of God's law, is under his wrath and curse, and can in no way escape eternal damnation, but by repenting of the sin; nor even thus without the blood of atonement, without the shedding of which there is no remission. If the evangelical doctrine of Christ crucified for our sins, teaches anything, it teaches just this, and nothing short of it.

To deny this is a practical repudiation of the whole evangelical system, and of the Bible that reveals it, if the Orthodox exegesis and creeds are worth the blank paper they are written upon. The common sense of the masses of the people will compel them to see this, whatever the Doctor of Divinity who presides over *The Independent* may think of it.

The Independent stigmatizes Mr. Garrison as an infidel, because like George Fox, William Penn, and perhaps Moses Stuart, he receives not our Orthodox belief in the plenary divine inspiration of the whole Bible. And it doubtless

regards as heretical those who deny the Orthodox creeds. Far be it from us to favor either the lax theologies or the vague views of inspiration that keep company with them. We dread their practical influence in supporting the lax ethics taught by *The Independent* in this very instance, and almost always when "political ethics" are involved. But how shall we censure Mr. Garrison, or call him infidel or even heretical, as compared with the editor of *The Independent*, acknowledging him to be "orthodox"—when the former receives and the latter rejects the plainest and most practical truths of the Bible, in the sphere of "political ethics?" We can do nothing of the kind. And, in the name and by the authority of good old fashioned New England Orthodoxy, of the stamp of Hopkins and Emmons, we tell *The Independent*, sorrowfully, plainly, seriously, yet kindly, that in its "political ethics" it has sunk indefinitely below Mr. Garrison, and has large upward strides to take, before it can even approximate to the standard of his "orthodoxy" however defective and mistaken, at some points, it may be. It is the orthodoxy of godly practice, as old Jonathan Edwards so gloriously shows, toward the close of his immortal treatise on the "Religious Affections," that passes current at the Court of Heaven; and all other, as he there demonstrates, and in solemn irony satirizes, deserves only to be regarded with derision and loathing.

Thus much for the "orthodoxy" of *The Independent's* "political ethics." Of its "principia" of Congregationalism, of official oaths, of perjury, of civil government, of safeguards against "usurpation" and despotism, &c., we may speak at another time.

M. E. CHURCH and SLAVERY.

How much, or whether any thing, has been given to the cause of anti-slavery, by the action of the late Conference at Buffalo, is a question on which the friends of the cause will, of course differ. The great danger, we think, is, that this action will be regarded a finality, and that Methodist Abolitionists, instead of being encouraged to insist on further action, will be persuaded to content themselves with what they think they already gained. The Northern Independent takes a hopeful view, which we copy, below. But it strikes us that the desirable thing, for the purification of the M. E. Church is—not that they should be excommunicated or abandon by the angry men-stealers, but that the church should excommunicate them. But hear what a Methodist abolitionist says:—

From the Northern Independent.

NEW CHAPTER ON SLAVERY.

"We have, at last, a revised chapter on slavery—that portion of the majority report relating thereto, having passed, without material alteration, and by a decided vote. Considered as a finality, the alteration is anything but satisfactory; but if we regard it merely as a beginning, it may have some importance. It is hoped the Border will, for once, be true to its professions, and leave on the occasion now furnished. Those chivalrous, slave growing Methodists professed to go for the Discipline as it is, and threaten to recede if we make the slightest change. An opportunity is afforded them by this action of the Conference, to make their words good—they have leave to retire, in conformity with their character and intentions. Should this alteration have the effect to rid the Church of its incurably diseased Southern limb, the blessing would be inconceivably great. Many who have had good opportunities to judge of the result of the present action, express themselves confidently, that the South will go, and that this partial amendment will just as effectually cause them to slough, as would the most stringent prohibition. Should the anticipations of these brethren be realized, we shall rejoice; but we have our fears that they may not be so easily disposed of.

"Should they say, however, until absolute prohibition compels them to leave, we think they will not have to wait more than another four years. Change, once begun, cannot fail to advance, to the wholesome and decent point of entire interdiction. It is mortifying, that, in an age of light and progress, a General Conference of Methodist preachers should be able to take no higher ground against an avowed enormity.—With the horrors of this bloody, monstrous, immeasurable crime staring them full in the face, and openly rioting amid the sanctities of the Church, it is scarcely conceivable how they could exhibit such marked forbearance. Instead of applying their Godly advice, they should have made a lash of small chords, and driven slave-holders from the house of God, which they have so long made a den of thieves. But the advice is of such a character, and given under such circumstances as may well induce the impression that a blow is to follow. The fact of stern admonition, after so much discussion, tells that the soul of anti-slavery is beginning to embody itself for action. Let us work on, then, and transmute advice into law.—Heretofore,

we have not far, there can be no step, that of have reason of the Com could get the first inst milition, grined, we come at la from the sa

THE DEM cratic Conve was postpon little has yet be awaiting tion at Balti We give, speculations these two h seem plausi next, may p

STRIKING paper, we ar lishment of t contains two come to us i cess of going

DOUBTFUL the conclusi the Emperoi of later arriv

A DAUGHTER

At the Ob Professor Mo congregation Mr. Monro he occasional certain theor women from freedom. Bu as our wives asks, for the buy her own pockets, and which spilled ther.

Mr. Monro a woman who lived in South her, she with coming emb masters, she At the death pated, and co to the redemp efforts she lea mother could to lay up the after years of and died, an advice of a Q of the poor i done so. She village, from some rebuffs, hundred doll

At this jun that many w of Mr. Monro ward with M Every one Saxon appear to welcome h tion block. In

we have not been able to even advise, but, have gone thus far, there can be no difficulty in taking the only remaining step, that of making counsel mandatory. The report, we have reason to believe, was not what the anti-slavery part of the Committee and Conference, wanted, but the best they could get. We accept it then, repulsively feeble as it is, as the first instalment of action, and shall wait with deep humiliation, for something better. Disappointed and chagrined, we are not discouraged. Stern prohibition will come at last, and chattelism shall be driven indignantly from the sanctuary of God."

THE DEMOCRATIC CONVENTIONS.—The Southern Democratic Convention at Richmond, first appointed for June 4, was postponed to the 11th, and is now in session. Very little has yet been done by the Convention, which seems to be awaiting the action of the Northern Democratic Convention at Baltimore, commencing on Monday next.

We give, to-day, under the caption of "POLITICAL" some speculations of the *N. Y. Times* concerning the action of these two bodies, and the probable consequences, which seem plausible to-day, but the doings of this week and next, may possibly mar the entire calculation.

STRIKING COINCIDENCE.—While on the first page of this paper, we are giving reasons for apprehending the establishment of a caste of white slaves, our news department contains two instances of the fact of white slaves, which come to us in the papers, while our arguments were in process of going into type.

DOUBTFUL.—We give—as it comes to us—the news of the conclusion of the Chinese war, and the assassination of the Emperor of Japan—but must add, that, from the silence of later arrivals, it may be considered doubtful.

News of the Day.

From the Lorain (Ohio) News.

A WHITE SLAVE.

A DAUGHTER AIDED BY A CHURCH TO BUY HER MOTHER—AN AFFECTING SCENE.

At the Oberlin Church, on Sunday, the pastor stated that Professor Monroe would lay an interesting matter before the congregation.

Mr. Monroe came forward, and in substance stated that he occasionally entertained, and at times almost adopted certain theories adverse to the practice of buying men and women from slaveholders for the purpose of giving them their freedom. But when a toil worn woman, as white and delicate as our wives and daughters, knocks timidly at my door and asks, for the love of God, that I will give her something to buy her own mother from bondage, my hand goes into my pockets, and my theories are gone in a moment like 'water, which spilled on the ground can never be gathered together.'

Mr. Monroe then stated that there was in the congregation a woman who had been a slave.—Her father and owner had lived in South Carolina. Her father dying without freeing her, she with her mother passed to another owner, who, becoming embarrassed, was forced to sell them to different masters, she going to New Orleans, her mother to Texas. At the death of her third master the daughter was emancipated, and coming to Cincinnati, resolved to devote her life to the redemption of her mother. After many unsuccessful efforts she learned her whereabouts, and ascertained that her mother could be purchased for \$1,000. At first she thought to lay up the amount by taking in washing, but she found after years of trial that she might scrub until she grew old and died, and yet not save the requisite sum. Taking the advice of a Quaker friend, she resolved to visit the friends of the poor in the State of Ohio, and ask for money. She has done so. She has wandered from city to city, from village to village, from to farm, meeting with some encouragement and some rebuffs, until now she has gathered together nearly six hundred dollars of the required thousand.

At this juncture Hon. Ralph Plumb arose and suggested that many would like to see the lady who was the subject of Mr. Monroe's remarks.—Being requested, she came forward with Mr. Plumb, and stood a moment upon the stand.

Every one was astonished at her whiteness and purely Saxon appearance, and three thousand men and women arose to welcome her who had more than once stood upon the auction block. In figure she is tall and erect, was neatly attired

and her whole appearance was that of a well-bred but grief-subdued Saxon woman.

No further appeal was needed; the collection that was taken up for her benefit attested the feeling of the audience.

Mr. Monroe remarked that Mrs Piquet (we have neglected to mention her name before) visited Columbus during the session of the legislature, and although some skepticism was at first entertained about her having been a slave on account of her whiteness, yet when the facts were substantiated, men of all parties gave liberally. He added, that when men failed to sympathize with the slave because he is black, he thanked God that the opportunity was given for such men to exercise their benevolence towards men and women of their own color.

A WHITE GIRL STOLEN AND REDUCED TO SLAVERY.

Correspondence of The N. Y. Tribune.

WATHENA, Doniphan Co., K. T., May 24, 1860.

One of those outrageous occurrences that disgrace humanity, occurred at St. Joseph, Mo., on the 10th inst. The facts in the case are these: Miss Mary Jane Robinson, an orphan girl about eighteen or twenty years of age, light auburn hair, light blue eyes, light, fair complexion, has been living at the Belmont House, in Belmont, Kansas Territory, for the last ten months doing work as a free white servant girl. On the 12th inst., with a portion of her hard earnings, she crossed the ferry to St. Joseph to do some trading. Soon after landing she was watched by two men who knew her, and who had often seen her at Belmont. They went before an officer and made affidavit that she was the slave and belonged to one Mr. Trott of Lexington, Mo. A warrant was issued, but the officer, after seeing and talking with Mary, was convinced that she was not a slave, and refused to make the arrest. The Marshal was then sent for, who performed the humiliating and degrading act, and she was lodged in jail. Mr. Trott was telegraphed to, and came on, and claimed that she was a slave, and belonged to the estate of one Mr. Counsellor of Lexington, Mo.; of which he was administrator. He then paid Messrs. Toole and Evans for their services, and, without trial save the affidavit of these two men, he started with her for the interior of the land of whips and chains.

In answer to inquiries made of her respecting her parents, she stated that she was born in the State of Kentucky; that her parents died when she was quite young, that she lived with her sister until she was nine years old, and was then sent to the state of Illinois to live with her brother and aunt, that with them she went to St. Louis, Mo., and remained there until the Spring of 1859, when her brother, fearing that she would marry a young man whom he disapproved, gave her money and sent her to St. Joseph, Mo., where she lived several months prior to going to Belmont. She said she had received letters from her brother, informing her that he started to California this Spring.

Those who were acquainted with her say that she was industrious, intelligent, and respected by all who knew her, and that no one could ever suspect there was a drop of African blood in her veins. The probability is that she is a free (white girl), and that the men who swore she was a slave are perjured kidnappers.

O. B. G.

FROM EUROPE.

The Cunard steamship *Africa*, which left Liverpool on the 26th ult., calling at Queenstown on the following day, arrived here on Friday morning. The news embodies various matters of interest. There is no longer room to doubt the success of the Garibaldi movement in Sicily. His entire march upon the capital from Marsala appears to have encountered no serious resistance; and our latest advices leave his forces surrounding Palermo, and on the eve of attempting the capture of that city by assault. That the attempt would be triumphant there was no reason to doubt, as disaffection was universal in the city, and the royal troops could make no available resistance. At Messina a new outbreak had occurred, which had been temporarily suppressed. Throughout the island the utmost enthusiasm prevailed. The military were shut up in the forts, leaving the country in the hands of the insurgents. This representation of affairs is, of course, denied by the official bulletins of the Neapolitan Government which report the overthrow of the rebels and the entire loyalty of the peasantry. On the other hand a Geneva paper states, what the *London News* confirms upon what it declares to be unquestionable authority, that Garibaldi had already gained possession of Palermo, and had proclaimed himself Dictator of Sicily. This presentation of the case is doubtless a sanguine anticipation of the sure march of events. In the meantime the general aspect of events in Europe was becoming

ing formidable. The dissatisfaction of the Emperor of the French with the course of Victor Emanuel was no longer disguised; and the belief that he had concluded a secret alliance with the Emperor of Russia, in regard not only to the Italian but to the Turkish question, gained ground. It was also intimated that the *Moniteur*, in a few days, would contain a speech of M. De Lavalette, the French Ambassador at Constantinople, on the Eastern question, which would startle Europe with the disclosure of the allied plans. The reports from Central Italy are of dissatisfaction in the army, and discontent with the Administration of Gen. Fanti, the Minister of War. It was hinted that Papal money had not been idle in producing this state of things. The story of a misunderstanding between Gen. Lamoriciere and Marshal Guyon is contradicted. The English news has been anticipated by the telegrams of the *Prince Albert*.—*N. Y. Times*.

FOUR DAYS LATER.

By the arrival of the North Briton from Londonderry, 31st, we have the following:

THE SICILIAN INSURRECTION.

The dispatches repeat the assertion that Garibaldi had defeated the Royal troops, and entered Palermo, but they were not confirmed.

Several Neapolitan vessels of war had arrived before Palermo.

The *Paris Patrie* says the insurrection is being organized to such an extent that its definitive results are no longer doubtful. The fall of Palermo was inevitable, being only a question of time. As soon as the insurgents become masters of Palermo, Garibaldi will declare Sicily annexed to the Italian Kingdom, reserving the ratification of his resolution to universal suffrage. A provisional Government under Garibaldi would then direct the insurrection.

The dispatches from Sicily are contradictory. They announce a popular rising in Palermo, and that the bombardment was progressing; that Garibaldi had entered the place, or was expected to do so; while the Neapolitan dispatches claim the defeat and flight of the insurgents.

Late dispatches assert that everything was going on well for Garibaldi.

The English and French residents of Palermo had embarked on board the steamers of their respective nations. An attack by the insurgents was expected at any moment. The Neapolitan General would defend the town.

An official Neapolitan telegram of the 26th, says; This morning the insurgents were attacked by our troops, beaten and driven from their strong position at Parce, now occupied by our columns.

The insurgents sustained great losses. Another column is pursuing them in the direction of Nubia-malta.

Accounts by mail state that at Messina, on the 22d, order was maintained, but everything was ripe for an outbreak in case Garibaldi succeeds in entering Palermo, of which there was little doubt. The force was then estimated at 15,000, but is said to have been subsequently swelled to forty thousand. Intercepted.

The insurgents still occupied the heights surrounding Palermo.

According to a dispatch from the General of the commanding royal forces at Alcatraz, out of 5,000 men there were lost 2,800 in killed. Of the wounded no mention is made, for as the insurgents have "No quarter" for their war-cry, this column in the return is unnecessary.

Many of the royal troops who retreated to Palermo after the action with Garibaldi's forces died of fatigue.

A later official dispatch dated Naples, May 28, says the Sicilian bands are leaving the troops of Garibaldi, who have again been beaten at Piani, having had many killed and taken prisoners.

The insurgents lost one cannon and are in full flight, pursued by the Royal troops beyond Corleone. The provinces are tranquil, and the revolutionists discouraged.

The official *Donan Zeitung* publishes the following dated, Naples, 27th ult: "The bands of Garibaldi have been totally routed. Garibaldi is endeavoring himself to embark. The rebels accuse each other of treachery."

In contradiction of the above, is the following:

TURIN, Tuesday, May 29.

The *Official Gazette* publishes an official dispatch from Naples, announcing the arrival there of an English steamer with the following news:

"The insurgents have entered Palermo. A considerable part of the population have risen. The city has been bombarded by sea and land. The bombardment commenced on Sunday morning, and the firing continued when the steamer left."

PARIS, Tuesday, May 29.

The *Patrie* publishes, under reserve, the following dispatch:

NAPLES, Monday, May 28.

Garibaldi, having collected all his forces and military material, attacked Palermo on the morning of the 26th, made him self master of all the outworks, and succeeded in entering the town.

The *London Times* places no reliance on official telegrams from Naples, as sufficient time had elapsed to show they are sheer fabrications. The following is the latest intelligence received by the *Times* from an authentic source:

PARIS, Tuesday, May 29.

A telegram from Naples announces a popular rising at Palermo, and an attempted bombardment by sea and land

by the Neapolitan troops. The entrance of Garibaldi into Palermo was expected.

ITALY.

There had been a protracted and interesting debate in the Sardinian Chamber of Deputies, on the treaty ceding Savoy and Nice to France. Numerous telling speeches, both for and against the treaty, had been made.

Signor Ratazzi was among those who spoke against the treaty. He advised his party to abstain from voting. Count Cavour admitted that the sacrifice was a grievous one for Sardinia, but pointed out the circumstances which compelled it, alluding particularly to the necessity of maintaining the alliance with France.

LATEST.—The Chamber of Deputies on the 29th, by a vote of 225 against 33, approved the treaty—23 members abstained from voting.

SPAIN.

The Cortes were opened on the 25th by the Queen in person. She referred to the satisfactory settlement of the morocco war, and pronounced the relations with all powers satisfactory. The late Carlist attempt is deplored, but the danger being past, an amnesty has been accorded.

Senor Martinez de la Rosa, was elected President of the Cortes.

TURKEY.

Letters from Constantinople, state that the Sultan's health was causing much anxiety.

The Paris correspondent of the *Daily News*, gives a report that France and England had agreed to the partition of Turkey. England was to be offered a share, and if she refused, they would go in without her.

The arrival of the *Arago* puts us in possession of our European mails two days later than had been previously received, although the news is of the same date as that published yesterday by telegraph from Father Point. There is nothing reliable concerning Garibaldi's progress, though the latest intelligence announced that he was actually in possession of Palermo. Everything indicates that he is certainly meeting with popular sympathy and success. A very spirited debate had taken place in the Sardinian Parliament concerning the cessions of Savoy and Nice, but the vote had not been taken, though there was no doubt of the ratification of the treaty. The general European news is of no special interest.—*Times*.

CONCLUSION OF THE CHINESE WAR.

The schooner Page, which left the Bay of Jeddo April 23, and a steamer with news from China to April 10, report that the Chinese have concluded to pay the English government their expenses and accede to all their demands. The ports and the navigation of the rivers are to be free.

The Americans are charged by the *China Chronicle* with having been engaged in the coolie trade, and a proclamation has been issued by a distinguished Chinese official, warning them against the practice of kidnapping.

Assassination of the Emperor of Japan.

The Prince Gortairo, who was the head of the present Japanese Government, was assassinated on the 15th of March. He was going from his house to the palace with his train when he was attacked by fourteen Japanese dressed as travellers.

His retinue had six killed and several wounded. One of the assassins was wounded, and could not escape, had his head cut off by his comrades and carried off, to prevent his being recognized.

Two of the assassins were princes of high rank, and had the privilege given them of cutting open their own abdomens with a sword, thereby preventing their property being confiscated, and saving their families the disgrace which would result upon them had they been beheaded.

Thirty people were beheaded on the 1st of April, having been interested in the affair.

Since the death of the old Tycoon, under whose regime the treaty was made, there has been an entire change in the government, the present dynasty being opposed to foreign intercourse, throwing every obstacle in the way to interrupt trade and commerce that they possibly can do, without violating the treaty.

The opposition, at the head of which is Prince Meto, is reported as being as strong as the present government, and insurrection is momentarily expected. Guard houses, with stands of arms, are numerous, both in the towns and along the road to the city of Jeddo. All foreigners are requested not to go out after dark, and are advised by their respective Consuls to go armed at all times.

WASHINGTON, Saturday, June 9th.

MR. SUMNER THREATENED WITH AN ASSAULT.

Many rumors, some of an extraordinary character, prevail, as to Mr. Sumner. It appears that early last night, an individual representing himself from Virginia, called at his room, and imperiously demanded an explanation of certain parts of his recent speech. Mr. Sumner gave him no satisfaction, and ordered him to depart, which he did, with threats. At a subsequent hour, three others called, halting in the passage-way, and sent up word that they wished to see him alone. They refused the invitation to enter his room, where Mr. Sumner was surrounded by friends, and

left, sending a threatening message by the servant, that they would come with a force to assault him at 10 o'clock this morning, when Mr. Sumner's friends were again present. In view of these occurrences, some of them accompanied him from his residence to the Senate to-day, apprehensive of personal violence. They are determined to exercise watchfulness and precaution. The attention of the Chief of Police has been called to the subject.

To-day information was lodged with Mayor Berret, without the knowledge of Mr. Sumner, that the latter's room was improperly invaded, and that threats had been made against his life. The Mayor promptly investigated the matter, and procured an affidavit as to who the principal party was, and the substance of the language he employed towards Mr. Sumner.

Upon ascertaining the fact that the offender committed the act while in a state of intoxication, and did not intend any injury to Mr. Sumner, and regretted having done so, and was gentleman enough to apologize to Mr. Sumner for his conduct, the Mayor called upon Mr. Sumner and informed him of the fact, and assured him that if an apology was not satisfactory, he would promptly arrest the party charged, and hold him to bail for trial. Mr. Sumner, being assured by some of his friends that the offender occupied a responsible position under the Government, and in their opinion, did not intend to insult him, said he was quite willing to receive the apology of the person, and did not care to have him put under bonds, considering his word as good as his bond.

Accordingly Mayor Berret accompanied the gentleman, who gave his name as Captain Henry, to Mr. Sumner's room about 9 o'clock, to-night and he duly apologized to Mr. Sumner, which was accepted as satisfactory by the latter.

From the N. Y. Times.

The Presidential Contest.

The Democratic cauldron is beginning to boil again. The time for another attempt at nominating a Presidential candidate is close at hand. *The Southern wing of the party meets this week at Richmond*,—the Northern wing next week at Baltimore. The Richmond convocation will be merely preliminary. It will do nothing of any consequence, but will await the action of the Baltimoreans. Possibly it may pass some resolutions,—declare the unalterable determination of the Southern Democrats never to surrender the ground they took at Charleston, and make a tender of renewed harmony on these conditions. But they will make no nominations, and take no decisive action in advance of the other Convention.

The Douglas men are mustering all their forces for Baltimore. They are determined to make him the candidate, by a two-thirds vote if they can get it, and by a majority vote if they can do no better. They have been busy since the adjournment at Charleston in electing Douglas delegates from Southern States, to take the places of the seceders, whom they are determined to exclude. In this way they hope to secure a two-thirds vote, and they stand a fair chance of succeeding. The fact is, the nomination of Douglas has become a matter of necessity to his friends in the Northern and Western States. They have pushed the war upon his opponents to such an extent that his defeat involves their complete destruction. Besides this, it is undoubtedly true that, with any other candidate, the party would have the greatest possible difficulty in maintaining its organization in most of the Northern States. If he were the regular candidate of the whole party, supported by the Southern as well as by Northern Democrats, he would stand a very good chance of carrying several of the most important of the Free States. He is the only Democrat who has any positive personal strength at the North;—and he owes that strength to the fact that he is openly and defiantly at war with the Administration upon its Lecompton policy, and with the Southern Democrats on their peremptory demand for Congressional protection for slave property in the Territories. Virtually, there is no difference of opinion at the North upon these points. Men of all parties agree in hostility to both positions. They may, or may not agree, upon the abstract right of Congress to legislate concerning Slavery, or upon the doctrine of Squatter Sovereignty; but they do agree in resisting the demand of the Pro-Slavery ultraists of the South. Douglas is regarded as the man who has made the boldest protest against it, who has risked the most in resisting it; and this it is which gives him strength in the Northern States even beyond the lines of his own party.

But precisely the same thing weakens and destroys him at the South. His friends insist that when once in the field he will receive the votes of every Southern State. We doubt it. If he were the regular nominee of the party, perhaps he would; but he cannot, as the nominee of its Northern wing, put up in open defiance of the South, and on the express ground of flat hostility to the Southern claim upon the question of Slavery. It is quite common to represent the opposition to Douglas and his doctrines as confined to the politicians of the South. The people, it is said, do not share it. We see no evidence of this,—nothing even to make it plausible. With the exception of special efforts made in a few localities, there is complete unanimity of sentiment on this point among the politicians, public men and newspapers of

the South. We think, from the best information we can gather, that Senator Benjamin, in his speech, represented the general sentiment of the Southern States towards Mr. Douglas when he said, that he was "a fallen star,"—that he had "lost the confidence and support of the Democratic party," and that it was utterly impossible that this confidence should ever be restored. If Mr. Douglas should be nominated at Baltimore,—especially if he should be nominated by a majority vote, we believe he would lose several of the Southern States,—enough to prevent his election.

It is natural, we are aware, to presume that the South would rather see him President than a Republican. But they are not driven to this alternative. Indeed, many Democrats, South as well as North, believe that their only chance in defeating Lincoln lies in running two candidates,—one of whom may be able to break the phalanx of Northern States that are likely to vote the Republican ticket. Douglas, they think, might possibly carry enough free States to defeat Lincoln, even if he should lose so many Slave States as to prevent his own election;—whereas, any other candidate would inevitably be beaten throughout the North and West. And, in this way, the election might be carried into the House of Representatives, where the Democrats would, at least, stand an equal chance.

We are quite prepared, therefore, to see two Democratic candidates in the field, Mr. Douglas being one of them; and the result aimed at will be,—not the election of either,—but the defeat of Lincoln and the transfer of the contest to the Halls of Congress. If the House elects, they are, at least, quite as likely to choose a Democrat as a Republican. If they fail, the Senate will choose a Vice-President who will be the acting President;—and as a matter of course they will choose a Democrat. The plot is a good one, but is quite likely to be spoiled by the election of Lincoln.

POLITICAL.

THE RICHMOND CONVENTION.

RICHMOND, Sunday, June 10.

Robert G. Scott, of Alabama, addressed the citizens of Richmond last night, defending the Southern movement at Charleston, and denying that it was a disunion movement, but one to save the Union by maintaining equal protection to all. He denounced Douglas and squatter sovereignty in unmeasured terms. If the Richmond Convention adjourned to Baltimore, he would there insist upon the same Platform as at Charleston. If it was refused, he would come back to Richmond.

Mr. Fisher, of Virginia, also spoke, vindicating his course at Charleston.

Nearly all the delegates from Louisiana, Texas, Alabama, Mississippi, Georgia, South Carolina and Florida, have arrived.

There is a diversity of opinion as to the course to pursue, though nearly all are agreed on going to Baltimore to contest the seat of the Douglas claimants before taking final action. The difficulty is whether they should resume their seats if granted them unless the platform is rescinded. The Louisiana delegates demand of Virginia that the delegates should pledge themselves to withdraw if the seceders are not admitted to seats, it being contended that if Virginia will pursue this course, North Carolina, Kentucky, Tennessee, and a part of Maryland will follow suit, and that Calhoun Cushing will resign and leave the Chair.

The position of the New-York delegates is anxiously discussed. It is contended by some who have been to New-York sounding the delegates that they are ready to abandon Douglas, while others claim to be equally well assured that they are more firmly wedded to Douglas than ever, since the withdrawal of Mr. Seymour, and that some of them expressed a determination to oppose the admission of any delegates who are accredited to the Richmond Convention on the ground that they are disorganizers and not national Democrats.

Mr. Yancey will not arrive before the afternoon of to-morrow—his object being to take no part in the organization of the Convention. What course he will urge on the Convention to meet the views of the majority is not known yet. Both Rhett and Yancey have been in favor of nominating, and having nothing to do with Baltimore. South Carolina is not accredited to Baltimore, and will urge independent action.

The people of Richmond seem to take little interest in the Convention. There are no Committees of Reception or Arrangements, and no hall was engaged until yesterday. But few if any outside visitors are attracted here by the Convention from any of the States.

Great effort is made for harmony and united sentiment. The Convention will adjourn to await the action of the Baltimore Convention, and the delegates will immediately repair

to Washington to consult as to the course at Baltimore. Great feeling is expressed against the Douglas delegates from the South, who will claim seats at Baltimore.

WEDNESDAY.

The Convention at Richmond, has adjourned to the 21st inst., to await the action of the Convention at Baltimore.

THE DOUGLAS CONVENTION IN LOUISIANA.

NEW-ORLEANS, Saturday, June 9.

The Douglas Convention at Donaldsonville has adjourned. It was represented by one hundred delegates from twenty-one parishes. Resolutions were adopted condemning the Charleston seceders, and expressing a determination to abide by the Baltimore nominations. The delegates appointed to attend the Baltimore Convention go uninstructed. Ex-Senator Soule, Governor Wickliffe and Isaac Morse were the ruling spirits of the Convention.

At 2 o'clock Friday afternoon a fearful explosion occurred in the Fire-works Manufactory of J. W. Hatfield & Son, in East Williamsburgh, by which two men were instantly killed and several others severely and perhaps fatally injured.

Greely's Letter to Seward in 1854.

This much mooted document, has at last appeared, and occupies a full column of *The Tribune*, in small type. It commences thus:

NEW YORK, Sat. Eve., Nov. 11, 1854.

"GOV. SEWARD: The Election is over, and its results sufficiently ascertained. It seems to me a fitting time to announce to you the dissolution of the political firm of Seward, Weed and Greely, by the withdrawal of the junior partner—said withdrawal to take effect on the morning after the first Tuesday in February next. And, as it may seem a great presumption in me to assume that any such firm exists, especially since the public was advised, rather more than a year ago, by an Editorial rescript in the *Evening Journal*, formally reading me out of the Whig party, that I was esteemed no longer either useful or ornamental in the concern, you will, I am sure, indulge me in some reminiscences which seem to befit the occasion."

Among its important items are the following. After stating his editorial labors by agreement, to elect Seward Governor, he says,

"It was work that made no figure and created no sensation; but I loved it, and I did it well. When it was done, you were Governor, dispensing offices worth \$3000 to \$20,000 per year to your friends and compatriots, and I returned to my garret and my crust, and my desperate battle with pecuniary obligations heaped upon me by bad partners in business, and the disastrous events of 1837. I believe it did not then occur to me that some one of these abundant places might have been offered to me without injustice; I now think it should have occurred to you."

Then, after "the Harrison campaign of 1840," in which he was "again designated to edit a campaign paper," Mr. Greely adds,

"Now came the great scramble of the swell mob minstrels and cider-suckers at Washington—I not being counted in. Several regiments of them went out from this city; but no one of the whole crowd—though I say it, who should not—had done so much towards Gen. Harrison's nomination and election as yours respectfully. I asked nothing, but you, Gov. Seward, ought to have asked that I be Postmaster of New York. Your asking would have been in vain; but it would have been an act of grace neither wasted nor undeserved."

Let me speak of the late canvass. I was once sent to Congress for ninety days merely to enable Jim Brooks to secure a seat therein for four years. I think I never hinted to any human being that I would have liked to be put forward for any place. But James W. White (you hardly know how good and true a man he is) started my name for Congress and Brooks' packed delegation thought I could help him through; so I was put on behind him. But this last Spring, after the Nebraska question had created a new state of things at the North, one or two personal friends, of no political consideration, suggested my name as a candidate for Governor, and I did not discourage them. Soon, the persons who were afterward mainly instrumental in nominating Clark came about me and asked if I could secure the Know-Nothing Vote. I told them I neither could nor would touch it: on the contrary, I loathed and repelled it. Thereupon they turned upon Clark.

"I should have hated to serve as Lieut. Governor, but I should have gloried in running for the post. I want to have my enemies all upon me at once; I am tired of fighting them piece-meal. And, though I should have been beaten in the canvass, I know that my running would have helped the ticket, and helped my paper."

"It was thought best to let the matter take another course. No other name could have been put on the ticket so bitterly humbling to me as that which was selected. The nomination was given to Raymond; the fight left to me. And, Gov. Seward, I have made it, though it be conceded in me to say so. What little fight there has been, I have stirred up."

"Gov. Seward, I know that some of your most cherished friends think me a great obstacle to your advancement—that John Schoolcraft, for one, insists that you and Weed shall not be identified with me. I trust, after a time, you will not be. I trust I shall never be found in opposition to you."

CHURCH ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

[The following was received too late for insertion in our last issue.]

JEWETT CITY, Ct., June 5th, 1860.

REV. WM. GOODELL; Dear Brother:—At a meeting of the Executive Committee of the Church Anti-Slavery Society, on the day after the late Anniversary in Boston, it was voted to offer the following letter from Rev. Albert Barnes, for publication among the doings of the Society. The letter in question was in reply to one from Mr. Webster, which he was authorized to address to Mr. Barnes, by vote of the Committee, to the effect, "That if he (Mr. Barnes) would appear on the Platform of the Church Anti-Slavery Society, at its Anniversary in Boston and say—what he was understood to maintain—that no slave could be held in slavery on Christian principles, Hon. William Claflin, Vice President, would pay his expenses to the amount of \$50."

PHILADELPHIA, Feb. 28, 1860.

Rev. and Dear Sir:—I received your letter, with the accompanying papers, a few days since, and I am greatly obliged to you for your reference to my preaching in former years, and for the invitation to make an address at the Anniversary of your Society. I have seen no reason to change the sentiments which I entertained in earlier life on the subject of slavery, except to intensify them. And I expect not to change them, except in the same way. Most heartily do I wish that the Church—and all our beloved country—were clear of the evil, and most willingly would I do anything that I could to bring that about; and most heartily do I hail any well-directed effort to detach the Church wholly from the system.

But I am sorry to say that I cannot comply with your request to make an address at the Anniversary of your society. My eyes are in such a state, and have been for years, that I have been obliged to decline all invitations to make addresses at Anniversaries, and especially in cases where it was necessary to go abroad. Nothing more affects them than traveling in cars; and I do not go from home except when it is absolutely necessary. Will you please to present my thanks to the Hon. Mr. Claflin, for his liberal offer.

I am very sincerely and truly yours,

Rev. J. C. Webster.

ALBERT BARNES.

To those who want names, before they can embrace or endorse principles, and whose faith in truth needs to be shored up by a buttress of great men, before they can commit themselves to it with any such confidence and self-abandonment as to make them quit themselves like men and be strong—it may be of use to add to the above, that Mr. BARNES has expressed his approval of the Platform of the CHURCH ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY, and that he gave as his only reason for refusing to take the Presidency of the Philadelphia Branch of the Society, that the state of his health forbade his appearance at public meetings, or the assumption of any care or responsibility connected therewith. It was therefore laid upon one of the leading members of Mr. Barnes' church, PROF. C. D. CLEVELAND.

Let there be a few more meetings like the recent Anniversary at Tremont Temple, and let success be gilded on the brow of the Church Anti-Slavery Society, and all the world—not to say all the churches and ministers—will be wondering after it. The programme published in the *Principia* a few weeks ago, was carried out; all the speakers appeared and delivered themselves ably, except the REV. A. B. BRADFORD, who was tabooed by the Physicians on account of the Boston east wind.

At the Business Meeting in the Meionon Hall, the Treasurer's Report was presented by DEB. J. WASHBURN, and the entire Board of Officers and Executive Committee was re-elected for another year. A spirited discussion was also had upon

the causes which prevent the union of a larger number of the New England clergy and churches under the banner of the Church Anti-Slavery Society. Significant facts were elicited in the debate upon a proposition to send a delegation from the Society to Great Britain, in order to solicit the sympathy and cooperation of British Christians, with American Churches in abolishing American slavery. Rev. Messrs. Wallace, Webster, Hunt, Wiswell, Dunn and Cheever, and Brothers L. Tappan, C. G. Parsons and others participated in the debate. The proposition was finally referred to the Executive Committee with discretion, and the Society adjourned sine die.

HENRY T. CHEEVER, Sec.

Family Miscellany.

For the Principia.

LATELY LAURELLED.

I have not seen thy fair young face,
Since crowned thy poet lays,
And wonder if an added grace
Now, o'er its sweetness plays.

Yet could it be? Thou wert so fair,
With beauty scarce of earth,
A being not for noise or glare,
Thine was the household hearth.

Thy lips soft love, thine eyes meek light,
The smile that starts a tear,—
A cloudlet tipped with rainbow's bright,
Hov'ring 'twixt hope and fear!

A star has caught that wandering eye,
And haloed the young head,
Now joy has bid those pulses fly,
And quickened the light tread.
The world has heard soft warblings sent
Out on the midnight calm,
Has drank the gushing stream, once pent;
And blessed its holy charm.

How shines without the inward flame?
O, beautiful, most fair!
How sits the glowing wreath of fame
Upon thy golden hair?

B.

For the Principia.

STRAWBERRIES.*

Strawberries! Strawberries!
Fresh and red, and sweet:
Come from generous Nature's hand,
Ruby lips to greet!
O, will you buy my berries sweet?
Dear lady, will you buy?
For rosy lips like thine they're meet,
Dear lady, will you buy?
Strawberries! Strawberries!
Tokens from above—
Speaking our kind Father's care,
Telling of his love.
O, will you buy my berries red?
Kind gentleman, do buy,
And give them to the girl you'll wed,
O, will you come and buy?

* As sung by little Annie Russel, at the Strawberry Festival, given for the benefit of the Williamsburgh Industrial School, June 14, 1860.

For The Principia.

TABLEAU X.

(CONCLUDED)

BY MRS. MARIA GOODELL FROST.

"Mother" said Edwards, "one night after school, Mrs. Fitch wanted me to ask you if it would be convenient for you to have the Society to-morrow, she said it was not your turn but no one else felt able to have it."

"To be sure I can," said Lizzie, in a cheerful tone, "you may go, now, Edward, and tell her, and notify all the ladies near the church; and, Dwight and Clarence, you may go down street and notify the ladies there. Here boys, is the list of names."

Lizzie always had good bread and sweet butter, and in the summer, fresh fruit from her garden, and in the winter, apple sauce; if it was convenient she made a few cards of ginger-bread, and so it was no trouble to her to "have Society."

The house was always open for a prayer circle, or mater-

nal meeting; her carpets were not so costly as to cause any anxiety of mind, or interfere with any of her Christian privileges.

But we must not tarry longer at Lizzie's simple home; although it is one of the places most difficult to leave.

We seem to carry sunshine with us, as we tread the winding path from her gate, and begin to ascend the hill, from whence Esq. Easy's mansion is ever visible.

"How very beautiful the grounds are;" we can not but remark, as we advance. A gardener is constantly among the walks, shrubbery, conservatories and flowers.

There he is now, training that honeysuckle vine, that winds about the verandah columns.

We pass through a grand hall into a spacious parlor, where, at first, only darkness is visible. Presently we dimly discern the outlines of rich sofas, divans, mirrors, and other objects of a rarer kind, that we are unable to designate by name. We admire the paintings; the alabaster and other ornaments that far exceed what we are accustomed to rest our eyes upon.

The door is thrown suddenly open, and a stately and beautiful woman enters. "Is it Maggie? Oh! how she has improved!" Conscious of her charms she sits down, graciously to unfold them before us.

We admire! Maggie knows it.

She talks brilliantly of other lands, of who and what she has seen abroad. We listen for a time, and then growing weary, ask questions upon more familiar topics. Maggie has little to say of home, and heart. She has no children. Maggie Shirk never liked children.

When we speak of school days, Maggie is reminded that we are old friends, and offers to show us her house, her exotics, her garden. We love beautiful things, and wander about, until tea is announced.

Here Maggie presides in all her glory. Her table is magnificent, silver and even gold adorn it.

A great, square faced, stupid looking old man fills the large chair opposite Maggie. In the simplicity of our hearts we ask, "Can she love him?"

Nobody believes she ever tried!

Maggie neither loves, nor hates; believes, nor disbelieves. Investigation requires too much mental effort, and necessitates the trouble of controversy. Maggie delights in peace; the elements of thought and action create antagonism, and must therefore be avoided. Her views are in happy coincidence with any one she may chance to meet. In northern circles she appreciates Mrs. Stowe, admires Whittier, and listens to Beecher; at the South she smiles upon the "peculiar institution," and gladly avails herself of its privileges. Her harp is attuned alike to slavery or freedom.

Her adopted opinions are held abstractly; the practical being entirely ignored, in her system. She likes quiet, and is greatly disturbed by agitation. She has all the rights she wants, and wonders in her heart that women should care to have the trouble of property, or the responsibility of personal existence and individual action. For her part, she is perfectly satisfied with things as they are—her husband lets her do just as she pleases! And a thought beyond *self* has never entered her head.

And life, O! what a "vapor" life must be to her! None are made happy by her resources. The cup of cold water for the perishing is never extended, by her jewelled hand. She has nothing to give; nothing to do for any one but herself.

The coarsely clad are not welcomed to her mansion; it is cold and cheerless, excepting when opened for the gay and wealthy, at her annual soiree.

One scene more and we close the panoramic view.

Let us anticipate the retrospect of a life laden with God's choicest gifts, wealth, time, beauty, and talent, all aimless and unutilized. We see a brilliant and resplendent sun, setting behind a cloud of darkness and despair. There is a night of death, gathering up in its mysterious, awful shades, the irretrievable past. But why this agony of soul, why this dense atmosphere of doubt and dread pervading the inner sanctuary? What evil deeds can be arrayed commensurate with the torture of a worn and wasted soul? Alas! 'tis not the deep dyed page of positive guilt that fills to its deepest depths the awakened consciousness. But, ah! that awful blank, that terrible vacuum upon which the mind rests in disquiet and self-reproach. The influence, the wealth, the time, the persuasive charm, that to a needy

world might have wrought so much, are lost forever. Oblivion has spread its wings over the golden opportunities of the past, croaking in the now sensitive ear, the terrible language of the sad and awful curse. "Inasmuch as ye did it not." The dark deep night folds within its silent canopy each rainbow tinted treasure, *all, all* are gone. Star after star has set, and set forever, "for there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom in the grave."

Paragraphs from Kingsley.

Did it ever strike you, that goodness is not merely a beautiful thing, but the beautiful things—by far the most beautiful thing in the world: and that badness is not merely an ugly thing, but the ugliest thing in the world? So that nothing is to be compared for value with goodness? that riches, honor, power, pleasure, learning, the whole world and all in it, are not worth having, in comparison with being good and the utterly best thing for a man is to be good, even though he were never to be rewarded for it; and the utterly worst thing for a man is to be bad, even though he were never to be punished for it; and, in a word, goodness is the only thing worth loving, and badness the only thing worth hating.

Form your own notions as you will about angels, and saints in heaven, for every one must have some notions about them, and try to picture to yourself what the souls of those whom he has loved and lost are doing in the other world; but bear this in mind, that if the saints in heaven live the everlasting life, they must be living a life of usefulness, of love, and of good works.

There is something very wonderful in music. Words are wonderful enough, but music is even more wonderful. It speaks not to your thoughts as words do; it speaks straight out to our hearts and spirits—to the very core and root of our souls. Music soothes us, stirs us up; it puts noble feelings into us; it melts us to tears, we know not how; it is a language by itself, just as perfect in its way, as speech, as words; just as divine, just as blessed. Music, I say, without words, is wonderful and blessed—one of God's best gifts to man. But in singing you have both the wonders together—music and words. Singing speaks at once to the head and to the heart, to our understandings and to our feelings; and therefore, perhaps, the most beautiful way in which the reasonable soul of man can show itself (except, of course, doing right, which always is, and always will be, the most beautiful thing,) is singing.

All melody and all harmony upon earth, whether in the song of birds, the whisper of the wind, the concourse of voices, or the sounds of those cunning instruments which man has learnt to create, because he is made in the image of Christ, the Word of God *who creates all things*; all music upon earth, I say, is beautiful in as far as it is a pattern and type of the everlasting music which is in heaven; which was before all worlds, and shall be after them; for by its rules all worlds were made and will be made forever, even the everlasting melody of the wise and loving will of God, and the everlasting harmony of the Father towards the Son, and of the Son toward the Father, in one Holy Spirit who proceeds from them both, to give melody and harmony, order and beauty, life and light to all which God has made. Therefore music is a sacred, a divine, a Godlike thing, and was given to man by Christ to lift our hearts up to God, and make us feel something of the glory and beauty of God, and all which God has made.

CHILDREN.—I look on a blooming, smiling child, as I do on the earth in spring, when covered with verdure and flowers. I am delighted, and almost forget the uncertainties of the future in the beauty and joy of the present moment. But I soon recollect that the blossom is not the fruit; that there is nothing permanent in this gay scenery; that the harvest is at a distance; that the valuable qualities of the heart and mind ripen but slowly, almost insensible; that they are exposed to a thousand adverse influences; that they must be guarded and cherished with tender care; and that after all, we may reap but sparingly where we have sown with a liberal hand.

The hardest heart melts at the sight of infancy. In every home, however rude, however splendid, one being is embraced with sincere love—and that is the new born child. The young woman of fashion, whose affections have been dissipated by false pleasures, becomes another person as she

clasps her infant in her arms. New tenderness fills her bosom; new solicitudes and hopes spring up. She learns to live in the happiness of this little dependent creature.—*Clayton*.

THE MOTHER MOLDS THE MAN.—That it is the mother who molds the man, is a sentiment beautifully illustrated by the following recorded observation of a shrewd writer: "When I lived among the Choctaw Indians, I held a consultation with one of their chiefs respecting the successive stages of their progress in the arts of civilized life; and among other things, he informed that at their start they fell into a great mistake—they only sent boys to school. These boys came home intelligent men, but they married uneducated and uncivilized wives—and the uniform result was, their children were all like their mothers. The father soon lost all his interest in both wife and children. 'And now,' said he, 'if we would educate but one class of our children, we should choose the girls, for when they become mothers they educate their sons.' This is the point, and it is true. No nation can become fully enlightened, when mothers are not in a good degree qualified to discharge the duties of the homework of education."

NO MARROW IN HIS BONES.—The man who has no enemies is a mere drone in the great hive of created intelligence. He is a milk-and-water man who contents himself with doing no harm, while it is notorious he is doing no good. Such men are time-serving, fence-riding go-betweens, who creep after men of position and property, and hypocritically bow to men in the humble walks of life, take no part in public sentiment, and smile and smirk upon all they come in contact with. They glide through life undisturbed, and sink to obscure graves, unwept, unhonored and unsung.

In literature, as in morals, there is a certain taste and grace, which confer dignity on moderate acquirements; and there is a negligence and grossness that disgust, even when accompanied with incontestible superiority.

Narrow-minded men, who have not a thought beyond the little sphere of their own vision, recall the Hindoo saying:—"The snail sees nothing but his own shell, and thinks it the grandest in the universe."

Anger is the most important passion that accompanies the mind of man; it effects nothing it goes about, and hurts the man who is possessed by it more than any other against whom it is directed.

CURIOUS DEFINITION OF ICE.—When a boy, a native of the East Indies, (where he it remembered there is no ice) was on a visit at the house of a friend in Edinburgh, he was shown water in a basin that had frozen in the night. When being asked what it was, he said, "It was water fallen asleep."

The new planet of Dr. Lescarbault is said to revolve around the sun in nineteen days. The inhabitants must spend a large part of their time in making New Year's calls. What Methuselahs we should be, on such a planet as that!

We often make life unhappy in wishing things to have turned otherwise than they do merely because that is possible to the imagination which is impossible in fact.—*Hazlet*.

Love is our best gift to our fellow beings, and that which makes any gift valuable in the sight of heaven.—*Smith*.

If you want to annoy, and puzzle, and baffle a man full of trick and duplicity, you have only to practice a straightforward and simple integrity.

If you would have your laws obeyed, without mutiny, see well to it that they are pieces of God's law—otherwise all the artillery in the world cannot keep down mutiny.—*Carlyle*.

Four things come not back: the broken word, the spent arrow, the past life, and the neglected opportunity.

We might pardon the ungrateful if they would forget who are their enemies as speedily and completely as they often forget who were their friends.

WRITINGS OF WILLIAM GOODELL.

For sale at the office of the *Principia*:
DEMOCRACY OF CHRISTIANITY, 2 Vols., \$1 50
SLAVERY AND ANTI-SLAVERY (History of) 1 Vol., \$1 00
AMERICAN SLAVE CODE, 1 Vol., \$0 75

TERMS CASH.

D. D. NI HOLSON, PRINTER, 109 WILLIAM STREET, NEW YORK.